DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 348 HE 028 821

TITLE	Faculty Roles and Responsibilities.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	7 Nov 95
NOTE	17p.; For related documents on faculty roles and responsibilities, see ED 366 285 and ED 382 097.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; College Instruction; Colleges; Community Colleges; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Educational Quality; Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Incentives; Private Colleges; Productivity; Public Service; Research; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

As part of a larger Illinois Board of Higher Education initiative, Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (PQP), this paper reports on recent and current efforts to clarify faculty roles and responsibilities. A background section reviews PQP development and earlier reports and statements on faculty roles and responsibilities issued between 1993 and 1995 that trace development of Board thinking in this area. The next section outlines recent recommendations of the Board's Faculty Advisory Committee that address faculty roles, defining incentives and rewards, and faculty evaluation. The next section describes the conclusions of special task forces or subcommittees at three universities that examined faculty roles. In particular this section addresses faculty development, breadth of faculty contributions, rewards and incentives, and general analysis of PQP effects. The next section reports on community college work in this area. A final section discusses next steps and notes that many institutions and faculty had addressed these issues. It urges that institutions intensify planning efforts and particularly that they incorporate fundamental policies and procedures regarding faculty such as tenure, promotion, and salary policies into their campus-wide faculty plans. An appendix contains statements from the Faculty Advisory Committee. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 348

Item #4C
November 7, 1995

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Background

As part of its Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (P•Q•P) initiative, the Board of Higher Education has asked institutions to address issues associated with faculty roles and responsibilities. This request reflects the conviction that faculty work defines and shapes higher education, and that the explicit and implicit priorities of faculty have fundamental importance for institutional quality and productivity. To date, the Board has issued three papers, sponsored two statewide conferences, and begun statewide planning on this topic.

This initiative represents, in many respects, a further elaboration of efforts to implement undergraduate education policies adopted by the Board in the 1980s. This subject was first explicitly addressed in its P•Q•P context in September 1993 in *Enhancing Quality and Productivity in Illinois Higher Education: Faculty Roles and Responsibilities*. This report sought to define faculty productivity in broad terms, as well as highlight new ideas and practices on the national level that could serve as models and opportunities for colleges and universities. The report identified a number of ways that faculty contributions could more fully advance institutional missions and, thereby, improve institutional quality and productivity.

The Board of Higher Education has sought to engage institutions in a few select, but broad, issues concerning faculty roles and responsibilities. During 1993-94, the staff prepared three issue papers on faculty development, breadth of faculty contributions to colleges and universities, and incentive and reward systems which served as the basis for discussion at workshops held at Sangamon State University and DePaul University in April 1994. Nearly 150 faculty members and academic administrators from across the state attended this conference whose deliberations were described in *Faculty Roles and Responsibilities--A Status Report* (May 1994).

The May 1994 report also presented a statewide agenda for institutions, governing boards, and the Board of Higher Education. The report called upon colleges and universities to develop plans to enhance faculty contributions to institutional mission; to reexamine faculty personnel policies to ensure that these policies are consistent with campus priorities and mission; and to launch appropriate faculty development programs and review reward systems. The plan also called for the Board of Higher Education to convene follow-up conferences and meetings in support of campus initiatives and to work with colleges and universities to develop meaningful and reliable assessments of faculty work in order to better explain faculty contributions.

The Board clarified its expectations for this faculty initiative in its November 1994 P•Q•P recommendations. Foremost, colleges and universities were asked to include plans about faculty roles and responsibilities in their 1995 P•Q•P submissions. The report offered general direction about the scope and content of these plans. "It is expected that each campus' faculty will provide leadership in plan development and that plans will cover a multi-year period, with time-tables for implementation. Each campus plan also should describe goals and objectives and show how initiatives in three critical areas--faculty development, faculty contributions, and rewards and incentives--support and advance these goals and objectives."

HE 028 821

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Illinois Board of Higher Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Printed on Recycled Paper

In spring 1995, the Board of Higher Education sponsored a second conference on faculty roles and responsibilities. The conference was held at Governors State University and featured an opening address by Russell Edgerton, President of the American Association for Higher Education. Participating faculty and administrators met in groups organized by academic discipline to consider the peer review of instruction and faculty development. A final working session grouped participants by institutional type (i.e., community colleges, master's granting institutions, and doctoral institutions) to discuss strategies that encourage and reward instructional excellence. A May 1995 Board of Higher Education report, *Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Update on Recent Activities and Plans*, describes the conference.

Recommendations from the Faculty Advisory Committee

During 1994-95, the Board of Higher Education's Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) considered issues related to faculty roles and responsibilities. By the end of the academic year, the FAC's three sub-committees had produced position papers on *Improvement of Undergraduate Teaching*, *Broadening the Definition of Scholarship*, and *Faculty Incentives and Rewards* (see appendix). Although universities were not able to consider these position papers as part of their 1994-95 reports on faculty roles and responsibilities, they should do so as planning and initiatives continue through 1995-96. The position papers offer valuable insights and suggestions from a faculty perspective and reveal confidence that basic changes should and can be made to better support instructional roles, to embrace new definitions of scholarship, and to reward the diverse activities of faculty.

The themes of the three position papers overlap, although each makes specific recommendations. They emphasize the intimate integration of faculty instructional, research, and public service roles and that faculty assignments and responsibilities should be flexible and attentive to faculty abilities and institutional mission. Faculty, administrators, and governing boards should work together to define incentives and rewards that will "explicitly advocate and support teaching excellence." Institutions should clearly communicate expectations to faculty and provide levels of support that will help faculty meet expectations. Finally, the FAC emphasized that no new initiatives will be successful if thorough, fair, and appropriate evaluation systems are not also in place. The Committee has concluded that "effectiveness in teaching is not beyond reasonable evaluation. The means are there; they need to be used." The Faculty Advisory Committee continues to address issues about faculty roles and responsibilities and will prepare a paper on faculty development in the coming year.

Public University Reports on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

In response to the Board of Higher Education charge to give special attention to faculty roles and responsibilities during 1994-95, most universities established a special task force or subcommittee. All three campuses of the University of Illinois incorporated the examination of faculty roles into their strategic plans. At the Urbana-Champaign campus, the planning process resulted in a report, *Retaining and Renewing a Quality Faculty*. In January 1995, a Board of Regent's committee, with representation from each campus, produced a report on faculty roles and responsibilities. The universities involved in this process continue to address issues raised in this report. A task force at Eastern Illinois University produced a final report with eight recommendations on faculty development, hiring, instructional technology, evaluation, and rewards. After undertaking an extensive planning process this past year, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville will submit its plan to academic units for review, revision, approval, and implementation.

Three universities reported that they sent representatives to regional and national conferences to better inform discussions on campus. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville will hold a campus-based conference on teaching in November 1995, which will use workshop techniques developed by the American Association of Higher Education. Overall, universities addressed each of

the three major subjects outlined by the Board of Higher Education: faculty development, breadth of faculty contributions, and rewards and incentives.

Faculty Development. All public universities extend opportunities to faculty to enhance their instructional, service, and research skills. At many institutions, a central office for faculty development coordinates these activities. In the past, such offices helped faculty locate grants for research, allocated funds to attend conferences and seminars related to research interests, and offered programs and services to improve instruction. Recently, some of these offices have expanded or have merged with other units to encourage and support more broadly focused instructional development. For example, in spring 1995, the University of Illinois at Springfield merged the Assessment Office and Learning Center to form the Center for Teaching and Learning. The new center helps faculty develop curricular materials, refine teaching techniques, and learn new instructional technologies. Northern Illinois University has expanded its Faculty Development Office to offer similar services. The Task Force on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities at Eastern Illinois University has recommended expanding its Office of Faculty Development to better support teaching and to coordinate instruction with faculty research and public service functions. The Office will work closely with academic departments in identifying and offering needed services.

Universities are more actively acquiring instructional technology and training faculty in its use. Universities have sponsored workshops about the Internet, computer-assisted instruction, multi-media, and distance-learning classrooms. With rapid advances in technology, some universities are striving to better coordinate all of these activities. Illinois State University hired an Associate Vice President for Instructional Technology whose role is to "coordinate the acquisition, development, training, use, and evaluation of instructional technology."

Some universities have created or expanded special programs for newly hired faculty and graduate assistants. In the past, orientation programs served to introduce new faculty to the administrative procedures of the university. Now, orientation programs may occur over several days and include teaching-related programming. Chicago State University, for example, offers a two-day orientation program which includes workshops on "Characteristics of CSU Students," "Educational Research and Dissemination," and "Teaching Strategies That Work."

Mentoring programs also have been extended to aid the instructional skills of new and junior faculty. At Northern Illinois University, professors who have been honored as Presidential Teaching Professors serve as mentors. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale also have instituted programs to improve the pedagogical skills of teaching assistants. Northeastern Illinois University is a participant in the Preparing Future Faculty program, a Pew-funded program headquartered at Northwestern University. Doctoral students from Northwestern University come to Northeastern to observe and assist Northeastern faculty while learning about faculty roles at a teaching-oriented institution with a diverse student population.

Faculty development holds considerable promise as a mechanism to bring faculty contributions into greater alignment with institutional missions and to make qualitative and productivity gains. In this effort, institutions need to balance long- and short-term perspectives recognizing that faculty constitute a valuable asset and investment. While many universities have revived their faculty development programs, considerable progress can yet be realized by integrating faculty development into departmental, college, and campus plans and operations.

Breadth of Faculty Contributions. Almost all universities emphasized the diversity of faculty functions and how instructional, research, and public service roles reinforce each other. Some institutions have improved their capability to more fully measure and monitor faculty contributions to the campus mission. For instance, Illinois State University piloted the introduction of an electronically-based system that not only maintains data on each faculty member's teaching loads, course enrollments, and student evaluations, but also incorporates full-text documents, graphics, and

bibliographies presenting a broad representation of instructional, service, and scholarly activities. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale also created a typology of faculty roles and responsibilities. The University will test this typology during 1995-96 to better understand diverse faculty efforts. The data will then be used as a baseline for measuring change in faculty activities.

Institutions have focused most on redressing the lack of recognition for instructional roles, although some universities also have highlighted the need for better recognition of public service activities and various instructional-related tasks, such as individual or informal contact with students. Chicago State University, for example, evaluates faculty partly on the degree to which they facilitate the University's student retention plan, while the Task Force at Eastern Illinois University has recommended including service in its leave plan. Northern Illinois University and the University of Illinois at Springfield also are examining the advising role of faculty and its close association with instruction. Governors State University emphasized increased faculty involvement in public service activities.

Some universities have reported on the contributions of all instructional staff including not only teaching assistants at research institutions but also part-time faculty at some institutions. Eastern Illinois University, for instance, has decided to reduce reliance on temporary faculty, while a committee at the University of Illinois at Springfield has proposed that part-time faculty have access to instructional development opportunities. Northeastern Illinois University reports that part-time faculty are evaluated by the same criteria as full-time faculty.

Efforts to better measure and consider faculty roles have direct implications for establishing priorities about the allocation of faculty work. Institutions should more fully realize this potential, although some institutions have reported progress and have designated core and marginal faculty activities at departmental, college, and campus levels. One example is the task force at Eastern Illinois University's recommendation to reduce the amount of faculty time allocated to reports, self-studies, and program reviews by identifying duplicative or unnecessary data collection. An especially ambitious effort was Northern Illinois University's broad-based examination of faculty assignments resulting in a reallocation this past year of more than $400,000 from departmental administration and research to instruction. Northern Illinois University also restructured and reduced the amount of faculty time allocated to campus committees. When this process is fully implemented, the university anticipates there will be 250 fewer committee seats affecting 20,000 personnel hours.

Rewards and Incentives. Hiring, tenure, promotion, and salary decisions comprise the critical components of the reward system. P•Q•P reports indicate that a few institutions have reviewed their tenure criteria under this initiative. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville made perhaps the most significant change by establishing "meritorious teaching as a minimal criterion for tenure". In the coming year, schools and colleges will develop criteria to implement the new tenure policy.

Institutions also report greater variability in making individual faculty assignments among research, public service, and instructional functions. Northern Illinois University, for example, reports that "differential assignments are often accompanied by the opportunity for faculty to negotiate a differentiated weighing of the components of their work in the merit evaluation. Some departments, especially those in the Colleges of Business and Education, have for some time allowed faculty to 'contract' for their assignments and their merit evaluation in advance of the academic year....There is growing appreciation of the fact that faculty have differing strengths, or that their interests change over time."

The evaluation of teaching was a common theme in the P•Q•P reports. Improved evaluation represents an important precondition for changing reward systems or, stated differently, excellence in teaching will receive greater emphasis when methods for measuring teaching inspire more confidence. Institutions continue to rely heavily on student evaluation of teaching, although peer review and new approaches are receiving more attention. Faculty at some institutions have developed, or are

considering, "teaching portfolios" in which faculty collect materials that demonstrate teaching achievement and improvement over time.

Many reports communicate that evaluation methods and rewards and incentives will continue to receive close scrutiny. A task force report at Eastern Illinois University has recommended that upcoming collective bargaining negotiations should seek to refine methodologies for evaluating the quality of teaching, research, and public service activities. The University of Illinois emphasizes that "each campus has well established faculty awards programs; however, attention is being given to the number of awards being presented, the nature of these awards, and/or the criteria used for determining these awards as faculty roles and responsibilities are being called into question in light of the quest for enhanced quality in undergraduate education."

Rewards and incentives play a powerful role in shaping faculty behavior. Comprehensive surveys of faculty throughout the United States have shown that faculty who spend more time on research receive higher salaries irrespective of their type of institution, and such faculty have greater value in the national market. Surveys also indicate that faculty at all four-year institutions find that demonstrating research productivity has assumed greater importance in the tenure process. At many institutions, official faculty roles and responsibilities have remained unaffected by professional rewards and norms, and duties mostly involve teaching. Yet, even in such a setting, pressures to advance agendas that differ from institutional missions can inhibit qualitative and productive efforts. Initiatives in Illinois and throughout the United States demonstrate that more fully recognizing and rewarding teaching and other faculty roles can advance institutional missions and achieve P•Q•P benefits. These improvements can be made without weakening the mutually beneficial relationship that exists between scholarship and teaching or diminishing the intrinsic satisfaction that faculty derive from their profession.

General Analysis. P•Q•P reports demonstrate that this statewide initiative has afforded institutions the opportunity to make positive changes and address fundamental concerns. Some campuses have taken unique approaches. For instance, Northern Illinois University's change of its faculty committee structure and Eastern Illinois University's decision to strengthen the number of full-time versus part-time faculty were not topics of intense inquiry and action at other campuses. Most reports do repeat common themes and issues. Campuses especially have responded to new instructional needs such as incorporating new technology and pedagogies. Some campuses also are searching for a broader conceptualization of faculty roles and responsibilities--often centering on a reexamination of the role of scholarship and more attention to the complete range of faculty responsibilities. This kind of examination has broad implications for productivity and quality, particularly if linked, as discussed below, to planning processes and organizational change.

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville deserves special mention for its response to the faculty roles and responsibilities initiative. Campus leadership engaged the faculty and developed a planning process with strong participation by all academic units, as well as the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council. While planning continues, results already are notable, such as a new tenure policy, faculty salary plan, workload policy, and a proposed promotion policy. Perhaps most interesting and promising is the manner in which student learning and faculty instruction are now more closely related and mutually supportive. The University reports that its assessment plan has assumed a key role in strengthening this relationship.

> "The Assessment Plan evaluates students' skills development at the students' point of entry through placement tests and information collected during the admission process, at the midpoint through a variety of midpoint assessment measures, including the Rising Junior Paper (RJP) and student portfolios, and in the senior year with the Senior Assignment. Each of these assessment points has provided the University and the faculty with the kind of evaluation that improves teaching and learning productivity. For example, the results of the RJP have led to a general reconsideration of the way students learn writing at the University. In response to the results from the RJP, faculty have

initiated projects such as one focusing on writing across the curriculum .... Evaluating teaching productivity by evaluating student learning has both improved individual teaching methods as well as provided impetus for curricular changes."

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville is now considering how to target resources from its annual $250,000 faculty development fund to better support baccalaureate learning objectives and undergraduate education.

While other campuses have not approached Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville in either the comprehensiveness or ambition of their planning process, many institutions have made progress in responding to this statewide initiative. Some institutions are currently discussing how to develop informational systems and use organizational structures in ways that would allow them to more effectively address qualitative and productivity issues.

In this effort, one theme has been the role of the academic department. For instance, a recent study by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign recommended that faculty responsibilities be conceptualized on a "unit-wide basis". The report notes that "a strong department is one that can build on the strengths it has to be as productive as it can... The overall goal is to increase the productivity of the department as a single unit, not necessarily to construct productivity indices for individual faculty members." This approach enables a department to achieve its expectations for instruction, research, and public service, while retaining considerable flexibility in the assignments of individual faculty members. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale is also currently engaged in a process that is intended to more clearly specify the relationship between its departments and colleges based on their respective missions. The campus expects as part of this process that "individual faculty members within departments, institutes, and centers should be going through a similar evaluation vis-a-vis their colleagues and their immediate unit."

The creation and expansion of teaching and learning centers has placed greater emphasis upon instruction and offered a mechanism to introduce new ideas and practices. At many institutions, teaching and learning centers are assuming a more positive identity that seeks to go beyond the common association of faculty development with teaching deficiencies. The efficacy of these units will likely depend upon how well they form strong working relationships with academic departments, the setting in which instructional needs are most commonly articulated and addressed. These centers also can play a critical role in strengthening the general education curriculum.

Reconsidering the functions of academic departments and teaching and learning centers may represent a necessary starting point or precondition for some institutions as they seek to enhance the contributions of their faculty. In addition to such activity, however, the planning of faculty-related initiatives should continue to receive strong emphasis. Even in an environment in which there is considerable discussion and attention to faculty roles and responsibilities, effective campus planning is required to evaluate and sustain progress. The substantial incongruity that remains between national norms and rewards and many institutions' missions further illustrates the need for effective, campus wide planning. Another fundamental goal remains the active engagement of faculty. Perhaps one of the most hopeful signs on campuses and in the Faculty Advisory Committee's deliberations has been how many faculty are ready to propose and support change that would enhance the quality and productivity of their campuses.

Community College Reports on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

While community colleges were not specifically requested to give special attention to faculty roles and responsibilities as part of the P•Q•P process during fiscal year 1995, colleges did provide information through related initiatives and reports. *Vision 2000*, a plan to address state and local needs developed by the community college system in fiscal year 1993, affirms that the hallmark of the community college system is its emphasis on teaching/learning. Teaching is the major role of

community college faculty. Other important faculty roles described in *Vision 2000* are to provide community leadership and public service and to engage in applied teaching/learning research.

Community colleges addressed a variety of faculty roles and responsibilities in their fiscal year 1995 priorities statements, submitted as part of the P•Q•P initiative. Colleges listed priorities in each of the main areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, public service, and research. For example, as a campus priority, Belleville Area Community College cited facilitating the incorporation of faculty research into new academic programs. Joliet Junior College listed a two-week staff development program to move the classroom from a teaching to a learning environment. College of Lake County also articulated a well-developed public service and community leadership component in its priority statements.

Community college reviews of undergraduate education, submitted to the Board of Higher Education in August 1995, also gave examples of how faculty instructional activities enhanced the learning environment. Specifically, colleges reviewed methods of evaluation; incentives/rewards for excellence; policies and weight of undergraduate teaching performance in faculty promotion, tenure, and annual salary determination; the extent of student-faculty interaction inside and outside the classroom; the proportion of general education course sections taught by full-time and/or tenured/tenure-track faculty members; the extent of "active learning" (non-lecture) experiences at each level of course offerings; and the extent of student interaction with diverse cultures and teaching styles.

The community college reviews of undergraduate education highlighted the primacy of the teaching role for community college faculty. In one interesting study, South Suburban College of Cook County examined the dynamic of its teaching/learning process. The campus discovered that the degree of faculty-student interaction helped predict both student retention and student success and that faculty had become more aware of the value of supporting students outside the classroom. All community colleges have established methods of faculty evaluation, and many colleges use a variety of evaluation measures. For example, Moraine Valley Community College reported that evaluation of tenured and non-tenured faculty is a four-part process that includes self-evaluation, as well as evaluation by peers, students, and administrators. Evaluations influence the promotion of non-tenured faculty and are used for professional development purposes for tenured faculty. Another area of focus was the effective use of part-time faculty, with colleges demonstrating how the special skills, knowledge, and experience of part-time faculty enrich campus academic programs.

While the official duties of community college faculty primarily relate to instruction, recent publications illustrate the variety and extent of scholarly contributions by community college faculty. Applying a broad definition of scholarship and research that is not limited to original research, James C. Palmer surveyed community college faculty and discovered that perhaps 80 percent of full-time employed faculty were actively engaged in producing works of potential scholarly value. Included in the definition of research and scholarship, Palmer listed conference papers, publications, instructional materials, research/technical reports, community informational materials, exhibits and performances in the fine arts, technical innovations, and other products. These works are within the broader definition of scholarship receiving greater attention by all types of higher education institutions.

Community colleges are encouraged to continue efforts to advance initiatives concerning faculty roles and responsibilities during the coming year, as well as to develop and refine plans that enhance faculty contributions to institutional missions and improve campus quality and productivity.

Next Steps

The Illinois Board of Higher Education requested this past year that institutions undertake initiatives in a few select, but broad, areas described above, as well as formulate plans that would

enhance faculty contributions to institutional missions. The reports submitted to the Board demonstrate that many institutions and faculty have addressed these issues. If institutions are to sustain progress, however, they will need to intensify planning efforts. Therefore, the Board recommends that institutions incorporate fundamental policies and procedures regarding faculty, such as tenure, promotion, and salary policies, into their campus wide faculty plans. Campuses should report in their 1996 P•Q•P reports on how these fundamental policies and procedures are consistent with their institutional missions and advance institutional priorities identified in campus priority statements. Institutions should also report on how campus procedures ensure that all units can effectively implement campuswide tenure, promotion, and salary policies.

Efforts to articulate and strengthen relationships that link student learning and faculty teaching constitute some of the most promising activities taking place on college campuses. Noteworthy initiatives include integrating undergraduate assessment and faculty development programs, as well as expanding the role of teaching and learning centers. The Board of Higher Education strongly supports campus and programmatic efforts to strengthen the integration of teaching and learning.

Given the broad array of strategies and programs and the number of new initiatives now in place to enhance teaching and learning, sharing information across institutions about programs and results can yield significant benefits. For this reason, the Board of Higher Education 1996 Conference on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities will feature national and state speakers from model programs. Future conferences will, at least partly, continue this emphasis, reporting the activities and results of initiatives funded with new state resources.

Statewide academic procedures governing program review and approval should more fully consider the use of faculty resources and how faculty contribute to program quality and productivity. In this regard, Board of Higher Education and Illinois Community College Board staff should examine and report to their boards by July 1996 on how Resource Allocation and Management Plan (RAMP) guidelines and criteria might better evaluate faculty contributions. For example, in program review, the staffs should consider how RAMP criteria might help institutions to: consider use of diverse and improved types of faculty instructional evaluations such as student, peer, and self evaluations; analyze the full range of faculty scholarship and faculty development activities in advancing program quality; and examine diverse faculty assignments and workloads in maintaining reasonable cost. For program approval, staffs might consider how RAMP criteria can more fully address issues such as: the preparation of faculty to serve the students likely to enter the program; incentives, evaluations, and development of program faculty; and the knowledge and training of faculty in instructional technologies.

Board of Higher Education staff should also report on how statewide data systems support statewide and institutional evaluations of faculty contributions, and analyses of other higher education issues concerning faculty. Staff should consider whether institutional program development and review could benefit through improved collection, presentation, or distribution of statewide data. In this process, staff should examine, in particular, the content and use of the *Faculty Credit Hour Report Study* and the biennial report on *Employment in Illinois Higher Education*. For example, staff should examine the benefits of more fully incorporating faculty credit hour data into the Board's annual statewide program review report so that institutions have comparable information on faculty disciplinary workloads as they undertake their program reviews.

APPENDIX

Statements on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

Faculty Advisory Committee
to the Illinois Board of Higher Education

Improvement of Undergraduate Teaching

March 1995

In previous statements, Defining Quality: (March 2, 1993) and Protecting the Quality of the Undergraduate Core (May 3, 1994) the Faculty Advisory Committee has addressed the importance of maintaining a sound educational core in the liberal arts at four-year institutions as well as insuring quality and gaining access to the core. The FAC document, Quality and Faculty Productivity (July 13, 1993), provides guiding premises and details four areas of faculty endeavor, including teaching and other student related activities, research and scholarship, professional and public service as well as administration and governance. Consistent with this thinking, we are now addressing the improvement of undergraduate teaching since previously articulated goals and values cannot be achieved unless Illinois students encounter teaching excellence on each campus and in each class context during their undergraduate years. Teaching excellence must be part of the system as well as the culture in each Illinois institution of higher education.

For faculty, a supportive teaching environment includes four key attributes: (1) attention to multiple dimensions of scholarship, (2) leadership in instructional innovation, (3) concern with students' learning styles and critical thinking abilities, and (4) development of comprehensive evaluation of teaching performance. In such an environment, faculty would experience a sense of community around teaching as well as around research/scholarship which would socialize newcomers to an expectation of growing and flourishing in both areas. In this environment, administrators explicitly advocate and support teaching excellence by rewarding good teaching and encouraging efforts to improve teaching.

Teaching is a multifaceted enterprise. In dealing with undergraduates, it includes: preparing for classes, teaching in the classroom, instructing in the laboratory and studio, advising in the office, monitoring independent research, evaluating the quality of student work, working with living unit groups, and collaborating with students involved in internships and co-curricular activities. In all these contexts, faculty lead students toward the knowledge, skills, and creative thinking that are essential to full membership in society.

In order to attain an environment supportive of undergraduate teaching, we recommend the following:

1. Place professionals with intellectual and pedagogical competence, willing to commit energy and time to teaching into the classroom. Faculty who are underprepared in key subject areas or who are overcommitted to non-teaching tasks cannot perform instructional responsibilities effectively.

2. Hire full-time tenure-line faculty who are committed to teaching as well as to scholarship and service. Part-time faculty are less able to provide continuity or the out-of-class instructional support students need. The classroom is only one contained learning context; meaningful faculty/student interaction must also occur in other contexts if a complete instructional process is to ensue.

3. Provide tenure-line faculty with reasonable teaching loads and research and/or service expectations appropriate to the institution so the faculty can develop in all the areas consistent with the institutional mission. Recognize that the balance of areas of faculty endeavor will vary across institutions but such variations should still permit and encourage contributions to effective undergraduate teaching.

4. Maintain a reward system that responds to the faculty member who performs well in all areas of responsibility but especially in teaching. Create clear expectations for ways to demonstrate teaching excellence.

5. Emphasize teaching in hiring new faculty. Hire faculty with strong teaching credentials or strong teaching potential who are willing to make classroom excellence a major professional goal. Many hiring committees are requesting candidates provide a pedagogical colloquium in addition to their research oriented presentation as a way to demonstrate understanding of teaching issues.

6. Expand the definition of research so that the scholarship and creative work of faculty whose interests are pedagogical are included. The concept of scholarship should be defined, not just by evidence of the ability to advance knowledge through research, but also as the ability to advance knowledge through the integration, application and representation of this knowledge to others.

7. Ensure that graduate students planning careers in higher education have opportunities for closely supervised, critiqued instructional experiences as a part of their graduate training. Current professionals should be actively involved in preparing the professorate of tomorrow for the range of responsibilities which fall under the rubric of teaching.

8. Develop an institutional culture that support excellence in teaching. Validate the value of teaching in assessment reviews through the use of teaching portfolios, constructive peer evaluation of teaching performance, and the development of personal teaching goals. Provide inservice teaching opportunities as well as other teaching-enhancement mechanisms.

9. Support efforts to prepare faculty at specific institutions to respond to the needs and learning styles of learners, traditional and non-traditional, at their particular institutions. The relationship between learning and teaching is strengthened by an understanding of the needs of varied learners, ways to address these needs and alternative assessment approaches.

10. Support teaching effectiveness centers which serve faculty efforts to improve their teaching through a variety of means including but not limited to personal video-taping, consultant resources, speakers series, dialogue groups, and academic literary and video resources.

11. Ensure that incentives are in place to encourage sustained instructional excellence from tenured professors. Provide opportunities for instructional leadership, sabbatical leaves as well as resources for curriculum development.

12. Create cultures of academic collaboration and collegiality. Encourage team teaching, peer classroom visits, and interdisciplinary curriculum development. Encourage the discussion and sharing of instructional ideas in the ways scholarly ideas are part of the professional dialogue.

The quality of undergraduate teaching is critical to the entire process of higher education. Institutional culture must value and nurture excellence in teaching. Teaching integrates diverse faculty roles; teaching, scholarship and service inform each other. Teaching excellence should be a unifying force in the work of academics.

Broadening the Definition of Scholarship

March 1995

Colleges and universities, like other institutions in our society, are in the midst of dynamic change. According to Professor Ernest Boyer and his colleagues in the recent seminal book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professorate* (Carnegie Foundation, 1990) the conventional view of scholarship must be reinterpreted to take cognizance of four separate but related functions performed at our colleges and universities: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of teaching.

We observe that the totality of public and private higher education institutions in Illinois includes schools which range from world-class universities to traditional liberal arts colleges and to community colleges which stress not only college preparation but career education and adult learning experiences. Thus, it is inappropriate for the IBHE to create one plan and one set of criteria by which all academic institutions can be measured.

We advocate that each institution should decide the relationship among the four forms of scholarship that govern its mission. We, the faculty at these schools, know that at our institutions the various forms of scholarship that Boyer describes are alive and are continually the subject of constant reexamination.

The goal of higher education in Illinois over-all should be excellence in each form of scholarship. Scholarship by definition and tradition involves at least three attributes: (1) the timely contribution to the state of knowledge of a subject, (2) public dissemination to others, and (3) mechanism for peer review. In order to encourage excellence, effective evaluations must be worked out by those who are most intimately and daily involved in the work: faculty, administrators and staff. Governing boards, boards of trustees and administrators, working along with faculty, must devise reward systems which acknowledge the varieties of scholarship at each institution.

We reject the shibboleth of "teaching versus research". We agree with Boyer that scholarship, more broadly defined, should be a central part of the activity of every professor. To support that, we append a limited number of examples of activities in each category which are currently underway at many of our institutions.

The first of Boyer's categories is the *scholarship of discovery*. It is what has occurred at our research-oriented universities, especially since the Second World War, in the physical and social sciences and now also in the humanities, the medical sciences and business. It has been encouraged by the federal and state governments and by grants awarded by such groups as the National Science Foundation. Outside of research universities, faculty have often engaged in discovery with limited support from their institutions. In performing this type of scholarship, faculty often involve their graduate students and outstanding undergraduates.

The second form is the *scholarship of integration*. This may bring together discoveries made across different but related disciplines. One specific example is a group of historians, including some at the University of Illinois at Chicago, who have written a 500 page summary of the scholarship of discovery about women in the history of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. The major goal of this undertaking is to make this knowledge more accessible to nonspecialists and to faculty who teach survey courses in World History.

The third form is the *scholarship of application*. One example is the attempt to provide medical services to groups living in areas that are underserved by medical practitioners. Another example is that of a faculty member who discovered a bacterium that digests components of petroleum, which

is of great use in cleaning up oil spills in an environmentally safe manner. This type of scholarship plays a direct role in creating a better life for all our citizens. It also creates new economic activity which improves the prosperity of all our people.

The fourth and final form described is the *scholarship of teaching*. This is the work which involves two kinds of action. In the first, good teachers must remain up-to-date in their fields and synthesize information in those fields effectively and at appropriate levels of complexity. A second kind of activity is directed toward the improvement of the teaching process itself. One example is the development and dissemination of new effective pedagogical techniques. A group of Oakton Community College professors as a result of their work in critical literacy, created a faculty development seminar in teaching critical thinking skills that has improved the quality of teaching across the institution and has become a series of videotapes distributed nationally by PBS.

Each institution should look at the relationship between its mission and the kinds of scholarship that it requires to meet its functions and determine if the distribution of rewards such as salary, tenure, promotion and sabbaticals match the present mission and institutional objectives. Faculty members may be involved in a number of these forms of scholarship during their career, but the emphasis among these may change from time to time during a person's career. Faculty should be encouraged to develop all types of scholarship over the course of a career, but it is self-defeating to expect that a person can or will be excellent in all types simultaneously.

Expectations should be clearly stated and support provided for beginning faculty members so that it is possible to meet these expectations. Each institution should make it clear to their faculty what the expectations are, and peer reviews should reflect the institutional mission as well as the demands of the particular discipline.

We urge that the IBHE acknowledge the variety of types of scholarship and to offer leadership, enabling administrations and faculties to institute systems that reward faculty for scholarship appropriate to institutional mission statements.

Faculty Incentives and Rewards in Teaching

September 1995

In its May 1994 report on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities, the IBHE stated that "**It is clear that campuses need to ensure that hiring, promotion, tenure and compensation policies, as well as monetary rewards and incentives are consistent with campus mission.**" The report made clear that at present these policies and rewards are not consistent with campus mission. The IBHE cited a 1988 national survey which concluded that "there appears to be a growing gap between the importance that the public places upon instruction, and particularly undergraduate education, and faculty rewards and incentives which place greater emphasis on research." The Faculty Advisory Committee might add that a third major element that is usually a part of institutional mission is "service"--both to the institution and to the larger community. This, too, has often been inadequately reflected in systems of rewards and incentives. The focus of this report will, however, be on rewards and incentives as they apply to teaching.

Five assumptions underlie our approach to this issue.

1) While "incentives and rewards" go beyond financial compensation, they must rest upon a base level of compensation that is adequate. *An adequate level of compensation must, in turn, be based upon a performance level in teaching, service, and research that meets the expectations of the institution and its mission.* There is evidence at present (in IBHE report on *Fiscal Year 1995 Faculty and Civil Service Salaries)* that, in comparison with their peers nationally, faculty salaries in Illinois public universities fall short of adequacy (94.4 percent of the median national figure). Even more troubling, this situation has become worse in the 1990's than in the 1980's (99.4 percent in 1980, 96.5 percent in 1990, 93.4 percent in 1993, 94.4 percent in 1995). Although there are a number of individual exceptions, salaries at community colleges and private colleges in Illinois do overall meet a national standard of "adequacy." It is only after an adequate base level of compensation has been assured, whether through collective bargaining or some other method, that any form of monetary compensation can be meaningfully called an "incentive" or "reward." Adequacy must, of course, also be assured with regard to working conditions, academic freedom, and participation by faculty in institutional governance.

2) Rewards and incentives, to be effective, will vary from one institution, discipline, and individual to another. Nor are rewards by any means all monetary. If incentives have often been greater for engaging in research rather than teaching, it is partly because, for many, these incentives have been intrinsic--the sheer excitement of discovery--or the affirmation of one's professional peers throughout the nation or world. This has, in turn, often led to higher monetary rewards, as well, through greater competition for one's services and grants received. If excellent teaching is often rewarded less highly, it is partly because, while it too provides intrinsic satisfaction and personal affirmation from students and colleagues, it generally enhances one's reputation only locally.

Monetary and non-monetary incentives and rewards for research are thus generally provided through means already in place--and external to institutional policies. Incentives and rewards for significant teaching performance need to be *intentionally* offered through institutional policies on compensation and faculty development. In this way support can be given to specific activities directly related to revitalizing teaching. Whatever methods are chosen, they should touch the majority of the faculty, not just an exceptional few, as in annual "teacher of the year" awards.

3) There is no inherent dichotomy between teaching and research, and we do not wish to create one. They are not incompatible. They are, to an extent, mutually supportive. Good teachers must be up-to-date in their fields. Research ideas often arise out of the inquiry involved in teaching. They are

both essential, as is also the "service" component of academic work. Our point is simply to note the difference between rewards and incentives for each.

4) No one individual will necessarily be equally gifted in all aspects of academic work. We do not wish to see gifted researchers use that talent less in order to use a lesser talent more. Present evidence suggests, however, that there are many gifted teachers who are, under present circumstances, spending time on research which could, for them personally and for the advancement of their institutional missions, be better devoted to their real gift--teaching.

5) A higher priority given to teaching requires serious attention to the ways in which teaching performance is evaluated. Incentives and rewards should be based upon fair and effective assessment tools for evaluation of all three areas--teaching, research, and service. At present, evaluation of teaching is less well developed than evaluation of research. (Evaluation of service is probably less well developed than *either* of the other two.) Methods of evaluation need to be developed which are not too cumbersome to be functional and which evaluate more than popularity. Methods and criteria will vary from discipline to discipline. In some fields, good teaching involves "hands on" laboratory, studio, or clinical experience, often working with students one on one or in small groups. In other fields, abilities in lecturing or leading discussion are foremost. The Conference on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Excellence in Teaching, which was cosponsored by IBHE and the Faculty Advisory Committee in April 1995, has provided specific examples of evaluating teaching performance. These examples include self-evaluation, evaluation by peers, the development of teaching portfolios, as well as evaluations of faculty teaching by students.

Recommendations

With the above considerations in mind, we recommend the following:

1. Each institution should look at the relationship between its mission and its existing structure of incentives and rewards, such as salary, tenure, promotion and sabbaticals, to determine whether they are consistent with each other.

2. Each institution should consider additional rewards and incentives that are specifically directed to the enhancement of teaching. These might include development funds, changes in work load allocation, better support services, computer hardware and software, as well as forms of public recognition.

3. Faculty should serve primarily on tenure track appointments. The increasing reliance on part-time and temporary faculty not only exploits the individuals so employed, but is debilitating to the ends to which this report is directed. Effective incentives and rewards for teaching require faculties with long-term commitment to their institutions. The service component certainly requires that.

4. Hiring processes need, more than at present, to evaluate evidence on qualifications for teaching, as well as those for research. Prospective faculty should be required to submit such evidence.

5. Methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness need to be at least as effective as those presently available for evaluating research. Effectiveness in teaching is not beyond reasonable evaluation. The means are there; they need to be used.

6. Criteria for promotion and tenure should be clear and explicit. While general criteria may be similar for all disciplines, each discipline may have specific criteria which should be clear and explicit.

7. Specific attention should be given to faculty who are already tenured to ensure continuing growth intellectually and in teaching effectiveness.

8. Policies and practices regarding incentives and rewards should be determined cooperatively by faculty, administration, and the supporting constituency (normally represented by the governing board).